Easterling, Deborah

From:

Easterling, Deborah

Sent:

Monday, March 12, 2018 11:11 AM

To:

'Tammy Gainey'

Subject:

RE: Palmetto Utilities, 2017-228-s

Dear Ms. Gainey,

This is to acknowledge receipt of your Letter of Protest/Comments to the Public Service Commission of South Carolina. Your Letter of Protest/Comments will be placed in the Protest File of the Docket listed below and on the Commission's Website at www.psc.sc.gov.

Docket No. 2017-228-S - Application of Palmetto Utilities, Incorporated for Adjustment of Rates and Charges for Customers in the Palmetto Utilities and Palmetto of Richland County Service Areas

A Protestant is an individual objecting on the ground of private or public interest to the approval of an Application, Petition, Motion or other matters which the Commission may have under consideration. A Protestant may offer sworn testimony but cannot cross-examine witnesses offered by other parties.

According to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, filing a Protest does not make you a Party of Record. A Protestant desiring to become an Intervenor (i.e., a Party of Record) in a proceeding before the Commission may file a Petition for Intervention within the time prescribed by the Commission.

You can follow this Docket and other daily filings made at the Commission by subscribing to the Commission's Email Subscriptions at this link: https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Email; or you can also follow Docket No. 2017-228-S at this link: https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Dockets/Detail/116386.

If we may be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Deborah Easterling Executive Assistant Public Service Commission of South Carolina 803-896-5133

Sign up for Meeting Agenda Alerts: Text PSCAGENDAS to 39492

From: Tammy Gainey [mailto]

Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 11:03 AM To: PSC_Contact < Contact@psc.sc.gov> Subject: Palmetto Utilities, 2017-228-s

Commissioners,

I am appalled that you would abide by Palmetto Utilities proposal to increase rates for its customers in order to fund developer growth that they have incentivized.

I am a homeowner in the service territory of the Utility, and it would appear you agree with their argument that developer fees are eventually passed on to home buyers. Allow me to pose a question to you,

Commissioners, on a more personal level: If each of you were given a choice to add \$1000 to your mortgage for \$4 a month for the duration of your mortgage, or pay \$15 a month in higher utility bills for as long as you own your house, which would YOU choose? I would tend to think most of us would choose the former. Richland County already has higher property taxes than surrounding counties and higher electric rates than most of the country (with SCE&G) - and now we will be overcharged for sewer service? These are recurring expenses that will cause homeowners to reconsider moving to this county. I know it is making me reconsider my decision to move here.

Palmetto Utilities CFO Mark Daday has indicated that the Utility's stance on growth and developer fees is up for debate. It has been debated by nearly 200 ratepayers, HOAs, Senator Mia McLeod, and business owners all voicing they want higher developer fees. The only entity who is in favor of keeping low developer fees is the Utility. Why would you not side with the majority on this issue?

While low developer fees may be beneficial for growth of the Utility, higher monthly sewer bills will be detrimental to homeowners who are trying to sell their properties. Why would a consumer choose a house with a \$52.10 sewer bill (a rate which may likely increase year after year), when a house in another area will have a 60% lower fee?

Your recent order does not balance Utility and consumer interests. It definitely leans in the favor of the utility.

Regards,

Tammy Gainey